



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/871,861	06/01/2001	Thierry Bedos	10984.4US01	1445

23552 7590 09/13/2004

MERCHANT & GOULD PC
P.O. BOX 2903
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-0903

EXAMINER

DINH, KHANH Q

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2151

DATE MAILED: 09/13/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/871,861	BEDOS ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Khanh Dinh	2151	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
 - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 April 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 01 June 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>6/1/01, 3/3/04</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-21 are presented for examination.

Specification

2. Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a **single paragraph** on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because it includes all the limitations of claim 1 which has more than one paragraph. Applicant is advised to submit a **new abstract** in response to this Office Action. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claim 3 recites the limitation "the first user" in page 11, line 29, word 15. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. For examination purpose, Examiner assumes "the first user" to be "a first user".

5. Claims 5, 11 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The phrase "*and so forth*" renders the claims indefinite because it provides unclear meaning of the claimed invention. Applicant is advised to remove the phrase in response to this Office Action. Correction is required.

Claim Objections

6. Claims 2, 5, 11 and 17 are objected to because of the following informalities:

- In claim 2, Examiner is unclear about the limitation "sending the message to the server for on sending to a second user". For examination purpose, Examiner assumes the limitation to be "*sending the message to the server to a second user*".

- There seems to be a spelling error in claims 5, 11 and 17: "colour". For examination purpose, Examiner assumes the limitation to be "colour" to be "color".

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

8. Claims 1-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hanson et al. (hereafter Hanson), U.S. Pat. No.6,505,233 in view of Jacobs et al. (hereafter Jacobs), "Filling HTML forms Simultaneously: CoWeb – Architecture and Functionality", Computer Networks and ISDN Systems, NL, North Holland Publishing, Amsterdam, Vol.28, no. 7-11, pages 1385-1395, May 1996.

Art Unit: 2151

As to claim 1, Hanson discloses a method for exchange of data and user interface components over a network, the method including the steps of:

(a) enabling a first user (one of participants 1-4 fig.1) to logon to a server [a web server (16 fig.2) included server (6 fig.1)] (enabling participants to connect to the server and configuring to verify which participate is online/off line, see figs.1, 2, col.7 lines 11-48 and col.8 lines 3-20) and enabling the first user to create a message (electronic form) containing a data object (HTML form including name, network address, comment, see fig.3, col.8 lines 28-52).

(b) receiving from the first user the message together with an identity (network address field) of at least one second user (other participant(s) who should receive the form) to whom the message is to be sent (see fig.3, col.8 line 53 to ocl.9 line 28).

(c) sending the message to the second user upon the second user logging on to the server (the server send an email message to notify the receiving participants that a zaplet has been initiated and a segment to instruct a participant to view a web page according to the segment, see col.9 lines 29-65).

Hanson suggests that multiple users (participants) can view the electronic form including the data object (see col.9 lines 29-65) but not simultaneously. However, Jacobs discloses enabling users to substantially simultaneously open and view the message (allowing users to simultaneously view and use any HTML document, see Jacobs' abstract, sections 1, 2, 3.1.3). It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate Jacobs' teaching into the system of Hanson to support simultaneous work in the World Wide

Art Unit: 2151

Web because it would have enabled two or more users at remote locations to work with the same HTML document, required no modifications of the servers (see Jacobs' section 1) and thus reduced hardware or software overheads in a communications network.

As to claim 2, Hanson discloses a method for the exchange of data and user interface components over a network, the method including the steps of:

(a) a first user (one of participants 1-4 fig.1) logging on to a server [a web server (16 fig.2) included server (6 fig.1)] (enabling participants to connect to the server and configuring to verify which participate is online/off line, see figs.1, 2, col.7 lines 11-48 and col.8 lines 3-20) and the first user preparing a message (electronic form) containing a data object (HTML form including name, network address, comment, see fig.3, col.8 lines 28-52).

(b) sending the message to the server for on sending to a second user (one of participants) such that both the first user and the second user (participants) can substantially open and view the message including the data object (the server send an email message to notify the receiving participants that a zaplet has been initiated and a segment to instruct a participant to view a web page according to the segment, see col.9 lines 29-65).

Hanson suggests that multiple users (participants) can view the electronic form including the data object (see col.9 lines 29-65) but not simultaneously. However, Jacobs discloses enabling users to substantially simultaneously open and view the

Art Unit: 2151

message (allowing users to simultaneously view and use any HTML document, see Jacobs' abstract, sections 1, 2, 3.1.3). It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate Jacobs' teaching into the system of Hanson to support simultaneous work in the World Wide Web because it would have enabled two or more users at remote locations to work with the same HTML document, required no modifications of the servers (see Jacobs' section 1) and thus reduced hardware or software overheads in a communications network.

As to claim 3, Hanson discloses a method for the exchange of data and user interface components over a network, the method including steps of:

(a) a second user (participants 1-4 of fig.1) logging on to a server [a web server (16 fig.2) included server (6 fig.1)] (enabling participants to connect to the server and configuring to verify which participate is online/off line, see figs.1, 2, col.7 lines 11-48 and col.8 lines 3-20).

(b) the second user (one of participants) receiving from the server (server 16 of fig.2) a message sent to the second user by the first user, the message (electronic form) containing a data object (HTML form including name, network address, comment, see fig.3, col.8 lines 28-52).

(c) the second user opening and viewing the message including the data object for substantially viewing with the first user (the server send an email message to notify

the receiving participants that a zaplet has been initiated and a segment to instruct a participant to view a web page according to the segment, see col.9 lines 29-65).

Hanson suggests that multiple users (participants) can view the electronic form including the data object (see col.9 lines 29-65) but not simultaneously. However, Jacobs discloses enabling users to substantially simultaneously open and view the message (allowing users to simultaneously view and use any HTML document, see Jacobs' abstract, sections 1, 2, 3.1.3). It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate Jacobs' teaching into the system of Hanson to support simultaneous work in the World Wide Web because it would have enabled two or more users at remote locations to work with the same HTML document, required no modifications of the servers (see Jacobs' section 1) and thus reduced hardware or software overheads in a communications network.

As to claim 4, Hanson discloses a method as claimed in claim 1, wherein the data object includes all data needed to parameterize a graphical component of the user interface such that the second user can recreate the graphical component, the data object also being a component of the user interface (users from external sources can use content of the zaplet customizable and programmable zaplet, containing various text and graphical regions to execute a variety of functions and applications, see Hanson's col.4 line 54 to col.5 line 19 and col.7 lines 11-48).

As to claim 5, Hanson discloses a method as claimed in claim 4, wherein both the first user and the second user (participants) can deal with the data object in real time such that both the first user and the second user can view the result of the dealing (participants can view and input comments according to the content of the electronic form and the zaplet), the dealing with the data object being one or more selected from the group consisting of: highlighting, amending, deleting, and changing presentation as by text size, color, font, and so forth (participants can create a personal zaplet by inputting the text passage in the interaction part of the zaplet and displaying the update images, see Hanson's fig.7, col.12 lines 12-59).

As to claim 6, Hanson further discloses that at login the first user provides a first user identifier information (Participant's information with a network address) (providing an electronic form including eligible participants ' name and network address field), the first user information being included in the message together with a second user information of the second user (sending to the server with the information to the other of the participants), the first user and the second user both being registered with the server (see Hanson's figs.3, 4, col.8 line 46 to col.9 line 37 and col.10 lines 27-60).

As to claim 7, Hanson further discloses a method as claimed in claim 6, wherein the second user is a plurality of users (participants 1-4 of fig.1, see Hanson's col.7 lines 11-39).

As to claim 8, Hanson further discloses a method as claimed in claim 1, wherein to send the message the first user (participant) drags and drops the message (transferring the form including HTTP request information) onto a transfer area (image server 18 fig.2) of a graphic user interface whereupon the message is sent to the server (encoding the request information into a compatible format with browsers, see Hanson's fig.2, col.7 line 52 to col.8 line 45).

As to claim 9, Hanson further discloses a method as claimed in claim 6, wherein the message can be in one or more of a plurality of categories (various classes of participants), the first user and the second user specifying those categories of messages they wish to receive when registering with the server, the server maintaining a list of all categories (five classes of email clients: new PC email clients, web clients, older email clients, text email clients and American On Line clients) and, before sending the message to the second user, ensures it is of a category which the second user will receive, the message including at least one category into which the message can be classified (server can be configured to identify the capability of a participant, see Hanson's fig.4, col.10 lines 26-60 and col.11 lines 4-46).

As to claim 10, Hanson discloses a method as claimed in claim 2, wherein the data object includes all data needed to parameterize a graphical component of the user interface such that the second user can recreate the graphical component, the data

Art Unit: 2151

object also being a component of the user interface (users from external sources can use content of the zaplet customizable and programmable zaplet, containing various text and graphical regions to execute a variety of functions and applications, see Hanson's col.4 line 54 to col.5 line 19 and col.7 lines 11-48).

As to claim 11, Hanson discloses a method as claimed in claim 10, wherein both the first user and the second user (participants) can deal with the data object in real time such that both the first user and the second user can view the result of the dealing (participants can view and input comments according to the content of the electronic form and the zaplet), the dealing with the data object being one or more selected from the group consisting of: highlighting, amending, deleting, and changing presentation as by text size, color, font, and so forth (participants can create a personal zaplet by inputting the text passage in the interaction part of the zaplet and displaying the update images, see Hanson's fig.7, col.12 lines 12-59).

As to claim 12, Hanson further discloses a method as claimed in claim 2, wherein at login the first user provides a first user identifier information (Participant's information with a network address) (providing an electronic form including eligible participants' name and network address field), the first user information being included in the message together with a second user information of the second user (sending to the server with the information to the other of the participants), the first user and the second

user both being registered with the server (see Hanson's figs.3, 4, col.8 line 46 to col.9 line 37 and col.10 lines 27-60).

As to claim 13, Hanson further discloses a method as claimed in claim 12, wherein the second user is a plurality of users (participants 1-4 of fig.1) (see Hanson's col.7 lines 11-39).

As to claim 14, Hanson further discloses a method as claimed in claim 2, wherein to send the message the first user (participant) drags and drops the message (transferring the form including HTTP request information) onto a transfer area (image server 18 fig.2) of a graphic user interface whereupon the message is sent to the server (encoding the request information into a compatible format with browsers, see Hanson's fig.2, col.7 line 52 to col.8 line 45).

As to claim 15, Hanson further discloses a method as claimed in claim 12, wherein the message can be in one or more of a plurality of categories (various classes of participants), the first user and the second user specifying those categories of messages they wish to receive when registering with the server, the server maintaining a list of all categories (five classes of email clients: new PC email clients, web clients, older email clients, text email clients and American On Line clients) and, before sending the message to the second user, ensures it is of a category which the second user will receive, the message including at least one category into which the message can be

Art Unit: 2151

classified (server can be configured to identify the capability of a participant, see Hanson's fig.4, col.10 lines 26-60 and col.11 lines 4-46).

As to claim 16, Hanson discloses a method as claimed in claim 3, wherein the data object includes all data needed to parameterize a graphical component of the user interface such that the second user can recreate the graphical component, the data object also being a component of the user interface (users from external sources can use content of the zaplet customizable and programmable zaplet, containing various text and graphical regions to execute a variety of functions and applications, see col.4 line 54 to col.5 line 19 and col.7 lines 11-48).

As to claim 17, Hanson discloses a method as claimed in claim 16, wherein both the first user and the second user (participants) can deal with the data object in real time such that both the first user and the second user can view the result of the dealing (participants can view and input comments according to the content of the electronic form and the zaplet), the dealing with the data object being one or more selected from the group consisting of: highlighting, amending, deleting, and changing presentation as by text size, color, font, and so forth (participants can create a personal zaplet by inputting the text passage in the interaction part of the zaplet and displaying the update images, see Hanson's fig.7, col.12 lines 12-59).

Art Unit: 2151

As to claim 18, Hanson further discloses a method as claimed in claim 3, wherein at login the first user provides a first user identifier information (Participant's information with a network address) (providing an electronic form including eligible participants' name and network address field), the first user information being included in the message together with a second user information of the second user (sending to the server with the information to the other of the participants), the first user and the second user both being registered with the server (see Hanson's figs.3, 4, col.8 line 46 to col.9 line 37 and col.10 lines 27-60).

As to claim 19, Hanson further discloses a method as claimed in claim 18, wherein the second user is a plurality of users (participants 1-4 of fig.1, see Hanson's fig.1, col.7 lines 11-39).

As to claim 20, Hanson further discloses a method as claimed in claim 3, wherein to send the message the first user (participant) drags and drops the message (transferring the form including HTTP request information) onto a transfer area (image server 18 fig.2) of a graphic user interface whereupon the message is sent to the server (encoding the request information into a compatible format with browsers, see Hanson's fig.2, col.7 line 52 to col.8 line 45).

As to claim 21, Hanson further discloses a method as claimed in claim 18, wherein the message can be in one or more of a plurality of categories (various classes of

Art Unit: 2151

participants), the first user and the second user specifying those categories of messages they wish to receive when registering with the server, the server maintaining a list of all categories (five classes of email clients: new PC email clients, web clients, older email clients, text email clients and American On Line clients) and, before sending the message to the second user, ensures it is of a category which the second user will receive, the message including at least one category into which the message can be classified (server can be configured to identify the capability of a participant, see Hanson's fig.4, col.10 lines 26-60 and col.11 lines 4-46).

Other prior art cited

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

a. Gerace, US pat. No.5,991,735: Determining the behavior profile of the computer users in a network.

b. Gilchrist et al, US pat. No.6,081,832: Framework defining an email message as a number of distinct messages.

c. Gupta, US pat. No.6,446,109: Computers to send and to receive data using a transport mechanism or communications network.

d. Harvey et al., U.S. pat. No.6,487,583: System and method for allowing interaction and communication within like-mind communities.

e. Rust, U.S. pat. No.6,668,273: System for application viewing through collaborative web browsing session.

f. Schilit et al., TeleWeb: Loosely connected access to the World Wide Web, AT & T Bell Laboratories, Computer Networks and ISDN Systems 28, pages 1431-1444, 1996.

Conclusion

10. Claims 1-21 are rejected.

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Khanh Dinh whose telephone number is (703) 308-8528. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:00 A.m. to 5:00 P.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Zarni Maung, can be reached on (703) 308-6687. The fax phone number for this group is (703) 872-9306.

A shortened statutory period for reply is set to expire THREE months from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned (35 U. S. C . Sect. 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(A).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305 -9600.

Art Unit: 2151

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Khanh Dinh', with a stylized flourish at the end.

Khanh Dinh
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2151
9/7/2004